

REMARKS

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a)

In the Office Action at page 2, claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,693,134 to Stephens (hereinafter "the Stephens patent").

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, is directed to a coated article comprising a glass substrate and a copper oxide and manganese oxide coating over the substrate. The coating has a molar ration of copper to manganese in the range of about 0.8 to 1.2 and a blue color in transmission.

The Stephens patent discloses an interference pigment comprising a platelet-shaped substrate coated with titanium dioxide and additionally oxide compounds of copper and manganese, whereby the pigment powder color is dark gray (Stephens at column 1, lines 54-56).

The pigment of the Stephens patent is used as a replacement for conventional metal pigments in paints. These pigmented paints are typically opaque to hide the underlying substrate. Stephens specifically teaches that the dark gray color of the Stephens pigment provides "excellent hiding power" (Stephens at column 1, lines 59-61). Such interference pigmented paint is used for paints on outdoor use, such as paints for cars (Stephens at column 3, lines 59-61).

Paints, including the interference pigments of the Stephens patent, exhibit color via reflection, not transmission. Thus, one skilled in the art of coating glass would not apply a paint made up of the interference pigment of the Stephens patent on a glass substrate to achieve a blue color in transmission. Any apparent color would be due to reflection. Because the Stephens patent does not disclose a coating for a glass substrate that provides a blue color in transmission, the present invention is not obvious in view of the Stephens patent.

Therefore, claim 1 is not believed to be obvious over the teachings of the Stephens patent. Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/693,463  
Response Dated: May 4, 2007  
In Reply to Office Action dated December 4, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 1320D2

Claim 3 depends directly from, and adds further limitations to, claim 1.  
Therefore, claim 3 is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of claims 1 and 3 are respectfully requested.

In the event issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to discuss those issues before further action is taken on the case.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew C. Siminerio", is written over a horizontal line.

Andrew C. Siminerio  
Registration No. 30,803  
Attorney for Applicants  
PPG Industries, Inc.  
One PPG Place  
Pittsburgh, PA 15272  
Telephone: (412) 434-3798  
Facsimile: (412) 434-4292

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
May 4, 2007